

204

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-12242 of 2024
Date of Decision: 22.03.2024

Parag @ Akshay

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Vimal Kumar Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. G.S. Dhillon, AAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

This is a petition seeking regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.223, dated 22.09.2023, under Sections 406 and 420 of the IPC, 1860 (Sections 120-B, 419, 467, 468 and 471 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Panjokhra, District Ambala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present petition as his name has not been mentioned in the FIR. It is further submitted that the FIR was lodged against Praniti Chaudhary and Sandeep Sehrawat and the petitioner has been nominated as an accused in the present FIR being brother of Praniti Chaudhary. Apart from that, there is no incriminating material against the petitioner to connect him in commissioning of offences.

Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He prays for dismissal of the present petition stating that the petitioner has been actively participated in

commissioning of offence and has cheated the complainant for the huge amount. He has submitted that the petitioner had made their e-mail ID on his registered mobile number and had sent the said mail ID on whatsapp number of the complainant.

Be that as it may, considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner i.e. 03 months and 07 days as of now, who is a person of clean antecedents as is evident from the custody certificate added with the fact that challan stands presented on 16.01.2024 and out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far which is suffice to infer for this Court that the conclusion of trial shall take considerable time, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period.

In view of the above, the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition is, hereby, allowed.

However, it is made clear that any observation made hereinabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

22.03.2024

D.Bansal

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No